

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/910,604	HARADA, KOUICHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nelson D. Hernandez	2622	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Nelson D. Hernandez. (3) Daniel Bestor.
 (2) Robert J. Depke. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 07 June 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 12.


Identification of prior art discussed: Hirota, US Patent 5,291,294.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


 NGOC-YEN VU
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: A phone call was placed to the Attorney on record to indicate allowable subject matter to claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9-11, 13-16, 18 and 19; also to indicate that independent claim as written as written would be rejected in view of the Hirota reference (Fig. 13 discussed in col. 9, line 10 - col. 11, line 58).

The Hirota reference was presented the Examiner explain to the applicants representatives the similarities of the prior art to claim 12 as written.

Hirota teaches solid-state image apparatus (Fig. 13) comprising:

an image section (69) having a plurality of pixels (72) arranged two dimensionally in the horizontal direction and in the vertical direction (As shown in fig. 13 the pixels 72 are arranged in the horizontal direction and in the vertical direction), the image section (69) comprising a plurality of areas (as shown in fig. 13, the image section 69 is divided in two areas (left half of the image sensor and right half of the image sensor) as shown by a broken line dividing the image section in the center) each comprised of a group of pixels (note that each line comprises a group of pixels), each group of pixels is comprised of a plurality of immediately adjacent pixels in both the vertical and horizontal direction (the pixels in each half is grouped comprising a plurality of pixels adjacent in the vertical and horizontal direction); the plurality of areas being arranged adjacent in the horizontal and/or vertical direction (note right half and left half beside each other as shown in fig. 13);

a plurality of electric-charge transfer sections (a first electric-charge transfer section 68 composed by the plurality of storage register sections 75 and a second electric-charge transfer section 67 composed by the plurality of storage register sections 76; the first and second electric-charge transfer sections transfer the charges of the first and second half to a CCD section 77 and 78) disposed outside the image area (see fig. 13) for transferring the signal electric charges of each of the plurality of areas (first and second half respectively), respectively, in the horizontal direction, wherein at least one of the electric-charge transfer sections extends across the entire width of the image section (note that both the first and second electric-charge transfer sections extend across the entire width of the image section as shown in fig. 13); and

driving means for driving the plurality of electric-charge transfer sections in an identical direction (the first and second electric-charge transfer sections are supplied with driving signals ST Φ 1 to ST Φ 4 for transferring the charges in the horizontal direction and the transfer gates are provided between the adjacent storage register sections and for driving the transfer gates the storage sections are also supplied with drive signals ST Φ T),

wherein the plurality of electric-charge transfer sections (67 and 68) are disposed such that each electric-charge transfer section transfers only the signal electric charges of one of said plurality of areas (as shown in fig. 13, the charges from the right half of the image section (69) are transferred to the electric-charge transfer section 68 and the charges from the left half of the image section (69) are transferred to the electric-charge transfer section 67) (Refer to col. 9, line 11 - col. 10, line 61).

After explaining to Daniel Bestor, the teaching of Hirota compared to limitations of claim 12, Daniel Bestor agreed with the Examiner interpretations of the new found prior art. The Examiner suggested making Examiner Amendments to claim 12, to include the limitations "and at least another of the plurality of electric-charge transfer sections does not extend across the entire width of the image section". Daniel Bestor approved the suggested Examiner Amendments to claim 12.